

13

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. J. GARTRELL, OF GEORGIA,

IN

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

JANUARY 10, 1860.

The organization of the House being under consideration, Mr. GARTRELL said:

It was not my intention Mr. Clerk, until within the last few days, to detain the House by any general remarks until after its organizations; and I am free to say that nothing but a sense of duty, in this hour of peril to the Republic, could have induced me to alter that determination. No one regrets, more than I do, the existing state of things in this Hall. And yet I have a thorough confidence that the blame of our non-organization can in no way attach to me, or to the party with which I am acting.

The numbers and relative position of the Representatives of the different political parties on this floor are well known to the country. For one, I am content that the record of our proceedings up to this hour may be submitted to the judgment of the American people. The scenes being enacted here are but the beginning, in a legislative sense, of that accursed "irrepressible-conflict" doctrine of which we have of late heard so much; a conflict we are told by its author, between opposing and enduring forces—a conflict by the North upon the South. If that conflict is to come—and I wish to speak candidly, plainly, and respectfully to-day—if that conflict is to come, if war is to be waged on the rights of the people of fifteen States of this Union, and the solemn guarantees of the Constitution denied them; if our property is still to be taken and its prompt surrender refused us; if the principles of the Republican party are still to be maintained and their purposes accomplished; if we of the South are, by congressional action or the artful contrivance of unfriendly legislation, to be deprived of a full participation of all the territory belonging, of right, to all the people of all the States; then, for one, I am free to confess that, perhaps, it were better if this House should never organize.

If you, men of the Republican party, are determined to continue your aggressions on our rights, as I shall show you propose to do—if you will not stay the hand of aggression, in order to perpetuate the liberties which the people now enjoy to their children and children's children; if you are determined that this conflict shall come, then I warn you, and warn those whom you represent here, to beware of the dangerous ground on which you tread. If the crowding memories of the past and the transcendent glories of the present are to be forgotten and lost, and the glowing anticipations of the future are to be despised, then, upon your heads be the disgrace and dishonor forever. The present gene-

ration at the South, like their ancestors, may be truly classified, as law-abiding men, true to the principles of that Constitution which was conceived in a Christian spirit of concession and compromise, and ratified by the several States of the Confederacy in their sovereign capacity, in order, among other things, to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to provide for the general welfare, and to secure for themselves and their posterity the blessings of liberty. To that Constitution, when faithfully administered, we are yet devotedly attached; to a just constitutional Union we are ready now, as we have ever been in the past, to yield a faithful obedience.

Grant us then, the full measure of our constitutional rights, for nothing else will do; consider and treat us politically, and in every other respect, as your equals—for such we are. Cease your aggressions upon our rights—the constitutional rights of my people—for such we demand and will enforce, though it may sever this Union into as many pieces as there are stars upon the national banner. Do you tell me that by your action in the past you have established justice? The millions of our property in fugitive slaves of which you have wrongfully deprived us, in violation of the Constitution and laws of the land, brand you with injustice. Have we of the South had insured to us domestic tranquility? The blood of southern men shed at Harper's Ferry cries to us from the ground, and brands you with the acts of the poor miserable deluded followers of your misplaced philanthropy. The ghosts of the dead will haunt you, and the anathemas of the living will follow you forever.

I ask, if you have, by your course in the legislative halls of this Union, endeavored to promote the general welfare? The burdens imposed upon our people, the benefits you have exacted from us, afford ample evidence of your selfishness. Do you tell me that we have a more perfect Union? Why, sir, such have been the insults and aggressions of the people of the North, who ought to have considered my people their brethren for good and for evil, that we have scarcely any Union at all. It is a Union in form and in name, but neither in sentiment nor in substance. Those fraternal feelings that should animate every section, and warm and glow in the national heart, have been by your course, and by the course of your predecessors, turned into invective and hate; and, to-day, in the opening of the year 1860, you have precipitated upon the great, patriotic, American people, the great issue as to whether their Government shall be longer continued.

Mr. Clerk, it was remarked, a few days ago, upon this floor, I think by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. HICKMAN,) that the slavery question was the only political subject now dividing the people of this country. It is true, sir. Now I do not propose, on this occasion, as I have on this floor on other occasions, to enter into any defence of that institution. It needs none at my hands. Sanctioned and approved by an enlightened Christianity, recognized by the Constitution of the country, domestic slavery will be maintained as one of the inalienable rights of the people, to be defended, if need be, by a resort to arms. "To question our rights is to grossly violate them; to attempt to instruct us upon this subject is to insult us; to dare to assail our institutions is wantonly to invade our peace."

I say, I do not intend to debate that question. With me I frankly confess that the argument may be exhausted. I shall endeavor, however, to present to you briefly what I understand to be the rights of the southern people, and to which I invite the attention of the country; and especially the calm attention of gentlemen on the other side of this House. I desire to address you as my peers in every respect here. I wish to be understood—and I pray that I may not be misrepresented—I say that if I misstate a single position occupied by the Republican party of the North, or misquote the positions held by leading men of that party, I request gentlemen on the other side to set me right upon the record.

Now, Mr. Clerk, I propose first to state what I understand to be the rights, the legal and constitutional rights, of the southern people in this species of property.

In the second place, I shall undertake to show that those rights, so clear, so sacred, so high, are not only threatened, but boldly, daringly, and willfully assailed by the Republican party of this country. I shall announce the solemn fact, disagreeable though it may be to you as well as to me, to my people as well as to yours, that if this course of aggression shall be continued, the people of the South, of the slaveholding States, will be compelled by every principle of justice, of honor, and of self-preservation, to "disrupt every tie that binds them to the Union, peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must."

Mr. STEWART, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman be kind enough to repeat the last sentence to which he gave utterance? I did not hear it distinctly.

Mr. GARRELL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania desires me to repeat that sentiment again; I will do so with much pleasure. I wish to engrave it upon the tablet of his memory. I want him to send it home to his people, and tell them that a Representative from the South, representing upon this floor an intelligent, a law-abiding, a gallant, and patriotic constituency, declares here to-day that, if the avowed purposes of the Abolition party be carried out, if the doctrines of the Republican party be carried into practical operation, and if the assaults and insults upon our rights and honor do not cease, the people of the South will be compelled by every sacred principle of justice and equality and self-preservation to disrupt every tie which binds them to the Union, peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must. I hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania now understands me.

Mr. Clerk, I beg the kind indulgence of this House while I present a very brief synopsis of what I understand to be the legal and constitutional rights of the southern people. These rights are so dear and sacred to us, their violation will be attended with such momentous consequences, that I fear to trust myself to an oral recital of them here. Well, sir, what are these rights?

We affirm that Congress has no power or authority to interfere with the subject of slavery in the States, Territories, or District of Columbia. The Republican party disclaiming for the present any intention of interfering with slavery in the States, insist that Congress has sovereign power over it in the Territories, and ought to prohibit its introduction. We claim, as a high constitutional right, the faithful execution of the act for the rendition of our fugitive slaves. You deny the constitutionality of that act; and have, in several of the northern States, violated the constitutional compact by a practical and perfidious nullification of the law. You avow your determination to prevent the admission of any more slave States. We demand that slave States shall be admitted in the future as in the past. You proclaim your purpose to confine slave labor within its present limits, that it may ultimately become profitless, and thus work out its own destruction. We declare that justice to the master and humanity to the slave imperiously require its expansion and perpetuation. We hold that the people of the South have the right to go with their slave property into any and all territory belonging to the States; and when there, to be as fully protected in the uninterrupted enjoyment of that property as the northern man with his personal property. You traverse this right of justice and equality, and demand that all the territory now acquired, or hereafter to be acquired, shall be devoted exclusively to free labor. Now, sir, how stands the case?

At the formation of the Federal Constitution property in slaves existed "as matter of right" in all except one of the then States, and in each and all it was used, treated, sold, and conveyed as other personal property. It was intended, by the patriotic framers of that instrument, to be as fully and amply protected as chattels of any other description. The history of the proceedings of the convention, and the subsequent ratification by the several States, afford one unbroken chain

of evidence of the fact that without such an understanding, entertained and acted on in good faith at the time, the Union could not have been formed. Add to this the further fact that the courts, Federal and State, from the formation of the Constitution to this hour, have, in their adjudications, regarded and considered it personal property, and the position becomes undeniable that all the rights and laws of property attach to my negro as much as to your horse, and ought upon every principle of equality and justice to be held equally sacred and inviolate. Such being the case, I maintain that the Constitution and laws recognize and protect the right of property in slaves in all the Territories to the same extent that any other personal property is recognized and protected. To deny this position is an admission that there is a difference between slave property and other property, and that the former is not equal in the protection due to it with the latter. For myself, I repudiate such an admission, and maintain that property in slaves in the Territory is entitled to and should receive all the guarantees, and be secured to its owner by all the remedies regulating any other kind of personal property.

Viewed in the light of property, the common law remedies usually employed in the courts apply to it as to all other species of property. If your horse is wrongfully taken from you in the Territory, it is conceded that you may, by virtue of the Constitution and laws of the United States, punish the felon, and recover your property by an action of *trover* or *detinue*. The same remedies employed in this case should apply in all their force and effect where my slave is beaten, stolen, or detained. Upon this point I am sustained by a decision of the supreme court of my own State, pronounced in May, 1851. That court, after reviewing quite elaborately the *status* of slavery, formerly in Great Britain, and now in this country, held that the common law of England is inapplicable to the institution of slavery in this country, *except to protect the rights of masters*; and, after showing that slaves have been recognized as chattels—the subjects of contract and sale—by the courts in England and in Massachusetts, they say:

“Why not upon a *contract* for the person? Why should not *trover* lie in England for a negro there, bought in Georgia by a citizen of Georgia, from a subject of Great Britain resident in England? Upon the score of morality, of humanity, or of natural equity, I confess I see no difference. The ground that their law, not recognizing slavery, affords no remedy, is equally untenable. Their general law, giving remedies on contracts and to recover property, ought to be implied to slaves as other property.”

Now, sir, such being my own position, I will go a step further, and insist that, as there is doubt upon this great question, and as it is one of the first duties of all free Governments to see that the property of its citizens, of every character and description, is fully, amply, and effectually protected, I hold that if the courts should refuse to take cognizance of the case, or withhold prompt protection, that then it would become the imperative duty of Congress to secure and protect this species of property as all other property is protected—by positive congressional legislation. Nor do I believe that such legislation would at all interfere with that great principle of “non-interference by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia.”

I have thus given a synopsis of what I understand to be the constitutional rights which the southern people demand upon the subject of slavery.

Mr. SOMES. I wish to ask the gentleman if he considers these sentiments to be in accordance with the Cincinnati platform?

Mr. GARTLAND. I regard them as true sentiments, sentiments that should be maintained by northern men, as well as by the people of the South. It is foreign to my purpose to-day to discuss the Cincinnati platform. I am not here to make a political speech. When I do that, I generally take the hustings, upon the stump, and if the gentleman desires to debate with me the merits or demerits of the Cincinnati platform, he must come South, or I will go North if he prefers it. I would like the privilege of meeting your people, in your congressional districts, and tell them face to face what I believe to be the merits of the great national Cincinnati platform. Let me commend it to yours and to their most favorable consideration and observance.

Mr. SOMES. I guaranty that you can have a hearing in my district at any time, and a large audience.

Mr. GARRELL. I am very much obliged to the gentleman; and am sure I would reciprocate.

Mr. FERRY. I have listened to the enumeration the gentleman has just made of what he conceives to be the constitutional rights of the South. Do I understand him further to say, that if the South, in its own judgment, is deprived of any of what the gentleman has enumerated as the constitutional rights of the South, he will be in favor of a dissolution of the Union?

Mr. GARRELL. I will come to that point directly: for if the gentleman heard the statement of the matters I propose to discuss to-day, he will remember that the very question he has now propounded is one of the identical questions I intend to present to this House. I will answer the gentleman in a few moments, fully and sufficiently.

Mr. STANTON. I wish to inquire whether I understand the gentleman to say that he would desire to have the opportunity of presenting his views to the people of the free States upon these questions? I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, that if he will come to my district, the people shall be called together, and he and I will go together before them and take an hour about, to his entire satisfaction. I would inquire of the gentleman from Georgia whether he will reciprocate that favor, and whether he will go together with me through his district, and permit me to discuss the constitutional claims of the people of the free States.

Mr. GARRELL. Certainly I would; but would have to put you upon your very good behavior. (Laughter.)

Mr. STANTON. I ask no guarantees from the gentleman—none in the world. I would trust to his honor and integrity as a gentleman.

Mr. GARRELL. I am obliged to you for that expression—I ask no guarantees. I pray none from you; in the name of justice, in the name of the Constitution, and of equal rights and privileges, I demand my rights.

Mr. STANTON. I do not know that I exactly understand the temper of that remark. The proposition I made was that when he came into my district, he should come without any pledges, that I would ask no pledges from him as to what he should say, or how he should deport himself.

Mr. GARRELL. I misunderstood the gentleman's remark, and assure him I would never be wanting in reciprocating any courtesy.

Mr. STANTON. I have read in the newspapers of some exhibitions which do not look that way exactly.

Mr. GARRELL. And you will read of others as long as you allow your men to come South and circulate incendiary documents, and advise the slaves of the South to insurrection, murder, rapine, and plunder. As long as you do that, you must expect to be interfered with. I tell you, gentlemen, while we respect your every right, and while we would treat you, especially the gentlemen from Ohio, (Mr. STANTON,) with the utmost kindness and courtesy, yet, when you come among us, you must not disturb our peace, do we go North, and disturb your social relations? Why, Mr. Clerk, I served here during the last Congress, and heard, almost every day during the exciting discussions of that Congress, questions propounded to the gentlemen upon the other side repeatedly and again, to show what custom, what right the people of the South ever doled to their brethren of the North. I will yield the floor to any gentleman who will tell me, this House, and the country, (and I will incorporate his remarks in my printed speech and send them broadcast over the South,) when a southern man, or any number of southern men, ever combined for the purpose of disturbing, in the slightest degree, your social relations at the North. The question meets with no response; and echo answers, "Where?" Never. We disturb none of your rights. We leave them to be regulated by the Legislatures of your respective States, and in accordance with the general provisions of the Federal Constitution; and to be determined and decided according to your own notions and your own tastes. And we intend to do it.

Mr. HASKIN. Will the gentleman from Georgia permit me to interrogate him for a moment?

Mr. GARRELL. Yes; provided the question is pertinent.

Mr. HASKIN. The gentleman from Georgia has stated that he was opposed to the Republican doctrine of intervention by Congress to prohibit the extension of slavery into the Territories. He has also stated that, in a certain contingency, he would expect that Congress should intervene to protect slavery in the Territories. I desire to ask him, if the Legislature of Kansas, in its Territorial condition, should do as Nebraska has been recently attempting to do—prohibit slavery within the Territory during its Territorial existence—whether he and the South would claim that that was an infringement of their rights of property to that extent which would justify them in seceding from the Union? In other words, whether, if the doctrines enunciated by Judge Douglas on the subject of the power of the Territorial Legislatures shall be acted upon, the South would insist on the protection by Congress of their slave property, as higher property than the horse; and that, in case of non-protection, the South would claim the right and would secede?

MR. CAETRELL. Do I understand the gentleman from New York, who has been recently acting with us on this side, to have suddenly become the champion, defender, and expounder of Republican doctrines and Republican principles?

MR. HASKIN. In reply to the gentleman from Georgia, he not having answered my question—

MR. CAETRELL. I will answer it.

MR. HASKIN—except in the Yankee mode of putting another, I will say that I am not the exponent of Republican doctrines; but, on the contrary, I antagonize them in regard to this *betrayal* of congressional interference to prohibit slavery, just as much as I antagonize southern Democrats in their doctrine of congressional legislation to protect slavery.

MR. GARRIBAU. The question put to me by the gentleman as to what we would do in a given state of things in Kansas, I conceive to be a judicial one. It is a question for the courts. If the gentleman desires to know my opinion in regard to squatter sovereignty or, as he calls it, popular sovereignty, I can tell him in a few words, although I did not wish, to-day, to discuss that question at all; for, on some future occasion, I intend, by the permission and kindness of the House, to define my position on that subject fully. I will not be diverted now from my purpose to discuss that question; but will say this to the gentleman: So far as my own opinion goes, I deny utterly, unconditionally, unqualifiedly, the right of the people of any Territory, by unfriendly legislation or taxation, or any other sort of legislation, to deprive me of my slave property or the right to my slaves in the Territory. I hold that the people of the Territory have none of the attributes of sovereignty; and that no power short of sovereignty can deprive me of my property. I go even farther, and to the extent of the gentleman from Texas, (MR. REAGAN)—and I was gratified to hear him make the announcement—that under our form of government, while the forms of the Constitution are respected, no citizen can be deprived of his property by any power whatever without just compensation, either in a Territory or in a State.

MR. HASKIN. I ask the gentleman from Georgia, as a representative of the Democratic party, whether it is his intention, and that of those with whom he acts, to insert a new plank in the Charleston platform to protect slavery?

MR. GARRIBAU. That is altogether a new question. If the gentleman wants to know what the Democratic party will do at Charleston, he can just come there. I have no doubt he will be making his arrangements to be present on that important occasion.

MR. HASKIN. I will be there, certainly.

MR. GARRIBAU. I will be very happy to see the gentleman there, whenever he comes as a Democrat; but if he comes representing the principles of the Republican party, as he does to-day, we will simply rule him out. (Laughter.)

MR. HASKIN. The gentleman has passed judgment upon me, I think, unfairly, in saying that I represent the principles of the Republican party; for I distinctly announced that I did not represent their principles, but antagonized them as I antagonize his principles. He wants a higher law to protect slavery in the Territories by Congressional intervention.

MR. GARRIBAU. Yes, sir; by the fruit the tree is known. The gentleman, I think, voted for JOHN SHERMAN for Speaker.

MR. HASKIN. I did sir.

MR. GARRIBAU. Then I assure you there can be no better indorsement of your Republicanism than that. Now, I hope I will be allowed to go on with my remarks.

MR. HASKIN. Did you not vote for Mr. MAYNARD and Mr. BORELEN, both members of the American party?

MR. GARRIBAU. I did, sir, with great pleasure.

MR. HASKIN. Then, as they were both members of that party, and as Mr. MAYNARD is an American, and was an elector for Mr. Fillmore in 1856, the gentleman, in voting for him, would be, on his argument, an American.

MR. GARRIBAU. It is not the first time that remark has been made, and it has lost its point; I therefore do not deem it necessary to waste time by replying to it.

MR. KELLER. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

MR. GARRIBAU. Certainly.

MR. KELLER. Occupying a position independent of party obligations, I wish to answer a question which has been asked members on this side of the House. It is, whether those who supported Mr. MAYNARD or Mr. BORELEN, accepted the American party by that act. I answer, no; but I do charge that those who support Mr. SHERMAN, the nominee of the Republican party, become Republicans by that single act. The distinction is this: the hostile and aggressive attitude assumed by the Republican party on the question of slavery—an attitude hostile and aggressive against both the South and the Constitution—has rallied in a common opposition to it all the other parties on this floor, thus announcing to the country that all party divisions and party distinctions gave way for the time before a combined opposition to the common enemy. The Democrat, then, who votes for an American, or the American who votes for a Democrat, only says, that, being driven to a choice, he selects the party which is the nearest to him; and this, too, only to carry out

his opposition to the Republican organization. The Republican party is our common enemy, and, therefore, we can unite without absorption. But it is not the same with any one who votes for the Republican nominee. By that vote, he declares that the extreme and fanatical attitude of that party upon the question of slavery approaches nearer to his own attitude than that of any of the other parties, and that he sympathizes more closely with its views. Any one who concurs with the Republicans in their policy touching the question of slavery, concurs with them in the only part of their policy which is vital, and common to all of the members of that party, and is, and must be, a Republican. Parties may combine against a foe common to them all without being absorbed, but individuals who go over to the enemy, in the very crisis of the fight, are of the enemy, and must be so held. At this stage of the contest, now, and upon this floor, it is only Republicanism and anti-Republicanism, and whoever acts with the Republicans, accepts that party against all the parties now in opposition to it. Let every member take his responsibility, without slippery evasion or juggling finesse.

MR. GARTRELL. I decline further interruptions, except for personal explanations. I now come to my second proposition.

MR. FERRY. I understand the gentleman from Georgia to say that the exclusion of slavery from the Territories, by act of the Territorial Legislatures, would be in violation of that provision of the Constitution of the United States which forbids the taking private property without compensation. Now, as the States are, equally with the Territories, subject to the operation of the Constitution, I wish to inquire whether it is the position of the gentleman, as it was that of the gentleman from Texas, (MR. REAGAN,) the other day, that the laws of the free States, abolishing or excluding slavery, are also within the prohibition of the Constitution to which I have alluded?

MR. GARTRELL. I have already stated, and supposed I was understood, that the States were sovereign, and that they had a right to determine this question for themselves.

MR. FERRY. Mr. Clerk—

MR. GARTRELL. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me. I will endeavor to make myself understood. I speak for myself; I am not here to speak on this grave question for any party. I speak my own sentiments and my own convictions as a southern man, and am responsible for them to the people I represent.

Now, sir, I pass on. My second proposition was to show that the rights I had endeavored to define as being inherent in the southern people are assailed, boldly, violently, and alarmingly, if you please, by the Republican party. How is this fact established? Let me call the attention of gentlemen on all sides of the House, and particularly the gentlemen on the other side, to the position assumed by the great sectional northern Republican party; and then I will put it to you, as candid men, as honest men, as freemen, to say in your hearts, in your consciences, if your rights were thus assailed, whether you could or would submit.

What do we hear? I shall not undertake to prove the sentiments I charge upon the Black Republican party by a resort to the declarations of such demagogued agitators as Cheever, Garrison, and Giddings, or any of that class of ultra Abolitionists, but will take the declarations of northern men, who, by their position here, I may safely assume, are exponents of Republican principles; and then, by living witnesses, I shall show to this House, and to this great country, that if these assaults are continued we cannot be expected to submit.

For the purpose of accomplishing that purpose, we need go no further back than the year 1848—to the celebrated Buffalo convention—and, in this connection, it is gratifying to hear the distinguished gentleman from New York, (MR. JOHN COCHRANE,) who is upon this floor an honor to his constituents and an honor to the country, repudiate the doctrines announced by that convention. That convention, which, if I am not mistaken, was presided over by the Hon. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, now an honored member upon this floor, and who, if I recollect correctly, was its nominee for Vice President, declared as follows:

"Resolved, That the true and, in the judgment of this convention, the only safe means of preventing the extension of slavery into territory now free, is to prohibit its existence into all such territory by an act of Congress.

"Resolved, That we accept the issue which the slave power has forced upon us; and to their demand for more slave States and more slave Territories, our calm but final answer is, no more slave States, and no slave Territory."

What issue has the slave power ever forced upon the North? To what issue do you refer?

As far back as 1848, the Abolitionists made this declaration. The Republican members say they do not belong to the Abolition party. Why, gentlemen, you not only belong to the Abolition party, as understood at that time; you not only avow the sentiments then proclaimed; but you have actually, upon these questions, stolen their thunder. You avowed, in your convention of 1856, sentiments as objectionable as those in 1848, proclaimed by the most rabid Abolitionists of the North.

MR. HASKIN. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me for a moment to make a statement in reference to the position of parties in 1848?

MR. GARTRELL. I cannot yield now.

MR. HASKIN. I merely desired to say—

MR. GARTRELL. I cannot yield; and state now that I deny the right of any gentleman to interrupt me, and to have his remarks, against my authority, incorporated into my speech.

MR. HASKIN. I merely wished to define the position which the Barnburners occupied in 1848. That is all. If the gentleman declines to yield, I will not interrupt him.

MR. GARTRELL. I certainly must decline. The gentleman can get the floor when I have done, and I will give him a very patient hearing. Now, sir, these resolutions declare hostility to what I have asserted, and sincerely believe, to be the constitutional rights of the South. But, furthermore, at the very next presidential election, in 1852, a convention nominating JOHN P. HALE, for the Presidency, and in their resolutions, after denouncing slavery as a sin against God, proceed as follows:

"That the fugitive slave act of 1850 is repugnant to the Constitution, to the principles of the common law, to the spirit of Christianity, and to the sentiments of the civilized world. We, therefore, deny its binding force upon the American people, and demand its immediate and total repeal."

That was the position of the then Abolition party of the North, in 1852, and it is the position of the Republican party to-day. But you are afraid to go into the contest of 1860 with the announcement on your part that it is your intention to repeal the fugitive slave law. There is, however, abundant evidence of that fact; and if there is to be a triumph of the Republican party in the country, which God forbid, the result will show that I am right, that it is the purpose of that party to repeal or modify that last small guarantee under the Constitution, left to the slave States.

MR. STANTON. I hope there will be a distinct understanding between the gentleman and this side. I understood him to say, in the outset of his speech, that he would be glad to be corrected when he was wrong. If he does not want to be corrected let him say so, and we will not interrupt him.

MR. GARTRELL. I will allow you to put yourselves right.

MR. STANTON. All I have to say is that the gentleman from Georgia is quoting from the platform of parties which I made war upon and resisted with all my power. Nine out of ten of the voting population of the free States, sir, voted against the candidates who ran upon the platform from which he has read and applied to us.

MR. GARTRELL. I am gratified to hear it. But, sir, I will show the gentleman in a moment where he stands. Did not the Ohio convention endorse identically the same sentiments in opposition to the fugitive slave act?

MR. STANTON. The gentleman desires me to make a statement; I prefer not to do it in a single categorical answer.

MR. GARTRELL. I state that it did, and defy contradiction; when I have done the gentleman can get the floor, and then show, if he can, wherein I am wrong.

I refer now to the celebrated platform of the Republican party, adopted at Philadelphia, in 1856. The nominee of that convention, John C. Frémont, a mere political adventurer, as has been remarked, received at the North, with a few votes from the South, one million three hundred and forty-one thousand eight hundred and twelve votes. I intend to argue this question fairly, and state my intention in stating this fact, and quoting from the Philadelphia platform, is to show that the sentiments there expressed are the sentiments of a ma-

majority of the northern people; and that, unless those sentiments are corrected, and the national Democratic party North as well as South in the coming contest of this year shall triumph and drive back fanaticism, the Constitution will be engulfed, and we of the South will be forced to fall back upon our reserved rights, and to defend them as best we may. What does that convention declare? Let the country mark it. It declares:

"That we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, of any individual, or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained."

I ask you, gentlemen, does that express the sentiment of the Republican party? Nobody will deny that it does. Let us go a little further. They resolve—

"That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government; and that, in the exercise of this power, it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those 'twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery.'"

I care nothing about your opposition to polygamy; perhaps you are more sensitive on that subject than we are. But when you assault the institution of slavery, which has been sanctioned by the approval of your fathers and mine, and is sustained by the Constitution of the country; when you denounce it as a crime, I declare that you ought not to expect, at least so far as I am concerned, for one, you need not expect, tame submission to such insult and aggression. I deny your right to interfere with the question of slavery anywhere. You have not slavery at home; we say nothing against that. The slave power, as you designate us, interposed no objection to the abolition of slavery in your midst. We say to you, if you want slavery, take it; but, if you do not, then abolish it. It is a matter for your consideration, and not for ours. We do want slavery; and, sir, in the language of one of South Carolina's distinguished statesmen and patriots, I tell you for the future, that, if you "dare assail that institution, you wantonly invade our peace," and that we will resist such interference at every hazard. That is our declaration, and we will make it good.

Look now, if you please, to the opinions of the leading representative men of the Republican party, contemporaneous with the action of their conventions, State and national—conventions representing northern States only. In addition to what I have read, what do your statesmen say? There is WILLIAM H. SEWARD, the great leader of your party, the head and front of it; a man of giant intellect—a man whose intellect is equaled only by his perfidy to the Constitution of his country—what does he say? If I misrepresent him, I ask to be corrected. He says:

"It (slavery) can and must be abolished, and you and I must do it."

Who is that appeal made to? The leader of the Republican party tells the northern masses, in a public speech, that slavery must be abolished. Said he: "You, you northern men, must abolish it." Abolish it where? Abolish it in the Territories? You deny that it can exist there. Abolish it in the District of Columbia? The gentleman from Ohio (MR. STANTON) says that that is not their object. Abolish it where? In the States? That is where he proposes to interfere with it; and there is where John Brown and his followers inaugurated this policy. He goes on:

"Correct your own error that slavery has constitutional guarantees which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished." * * * "You will soon bring the parties of the country into an effective aggression upon slavery."

Mr. Clerk, I am too much fatigued, being unwell to-day, to review these positions as fully as may be desirable; I may do so more at length on another occasion when less interrupted in the course of my remarks.

I have the declaration of another of one of your representative men, not of an Abolitionist, not of such as you, yourselves, call fanatics. Hear the words of a man who is in your confidence, and who has been by your suffrages elevated to the highest position within the gift of the people of his own State. Senator WADE, of Ohio, says:

"There is really no union now between the North and the South, and he believed no two nations upon the earth entertain feelings of more bitter rancor toward each other than these two nations of the Republic. The only salvation of the Union, therefore, was to be found in divesting it entirely from all taint of slavery."

I call the attention of the Representatives from Ohio to the declaration of the present Executive of their State. He is a leader of your party; he, too, is a representative man of your party, and has been but recently elected Governor of Ohio. Is that going out of the record? He declared that—

"If I am elected Governor of Ohio—and I expect to be—I will not let any fugitive be returned to Kentucky or any other slave State, and if I cannot prevent it in any other way, as commander-in-chief of the military of the State, I will employ the bayonet—*so help me God!*"

I ask whether Governor Dennison ever uttered such sentiments? (Voices on the Republican side "No!" "No!") I am very glad that they are repudiated here, and that that gentleman's friends are authorized to say that he does not entertain any such opinions.

Mr. STANTON. I desire to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am very much obliged to him that he has called our attention to it. I have to say that it is a slander which was repeated by the Democratic papers of Ohio prior to the election, but which Mr. Dennison repeatedly, unreservedly, and most emphatically denied upon the stump.

Mr. GARRELL. I am gratified to hear it. I have reported it as it was reported to me.

Mr. COX. I have heard Governor Dennison deny that he made any such statement; but justice demands that I should say that the report was based upon the affidavit of *two most credible citizens* of the third congressional district of Ohio, represented by my colleague, (Mr. VALLANTHAM,) who is not now present. He stated to me that he knew the persons well who had conversed with Governor Dennison; that he had good reason to believe at the time that the statement was correct; but that Governor Dennison denied that he made it.

Mr. GARRELL. That is sufficient for my purpose.

Mr. STANTON. It was represented as a bar-room conversation, that Governor Dennison had made that remark; and I desire to say that my colleague should not throw any suspicion upon the sincerity of Governor Dennison's denial, because repeatedly in stump speeches in Ohio he avowed his determination to execute all the laws of the State, and that he would not permit any interference with the execution of the laws of the United States within the State.

Mr. HILL. I desire, with the permission of my friend from Georgia, to ask the gentleman from Ohio, if Governor Dennison had made such a public declaration as has been imputed to him, and if that had been generally known, would the Republicans of that State have supported him?

Mr. STANTON. I have no doubt it would have lost him thousands of votes, if it had been believed. There is no doubt of it. I certainly do not entertain the sentiment myself. What I might do, if compelled to choose between a political friend and a political opponent, who uttered obnoxious sentiments, I cannot now say.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I can say, that if it had been known in my district that Mr. Dennison entertained, and had uttered such sentiments, he would not have received five hundred votes.

Mr. GARRELL. I am rejoiced to hear these disclaimers, but the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON) will not deny that Governor Dennison is unqualifiedly opposed to the execution of the fugitive slave law.

Mr. STANTON. I deny it most unquestionably. He declared upon the stump, repeatedly, that there should be no resistance to the execution of that law.

Mr. GARRELL. Is he opposed to the law?

Mr. STANTON. He is in favor of a modification of it, so that it shall not be used as a pretext for kidnapping.

Mr. GARRELL. I will tell you what the people of Georgia said upon that subject of modification in 1850. They said if there was any material modification of the fugitive slave law, they would rupture every tie that binds the Union together. When gentlemen talk about a modification of that law, I suppose they mean a material alteration, for I do not suppose they would stultify themselves by saying they meant an immaterial modification. When you speak of modification, you mean something tangible and material. Whenever you lessen the rights of the slaveholder for the recovery of his fugitive slaves under the fugitive slave law now upon the statute-book, it will be a grievance which, in my judgment, cannot be submitted to. Why, sir, the Governor of Kentucky, in his last annual message, announced the startling fact that the people of that State are annually deprived of \$100,000 worth of their slaves. They are decoyed into Ohio, where they are taken in, supported, clothed, and sheltered, and escape beyond recovery. At the last session of Congress I heard a gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LOYNG) proclaim upon this floor that, as long as he lived, his house should be open to every fugitive slave.

MR. STANTON. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he is opposed to such a modification of the fugitive slave law as, while it will not impair its efficiency, will at the same time protect the rights of freemen?

MR. GARTRELL. I do not believe that is practicable. I am opposed to its being touched at all.

MR. STANTON. Then the gentleman will insist upon a law which may be used for the purpose of kidnapping.

MR. GARTRELL. No, sir. I say I am opposed, directly and indirectly, collaterally or otherwise, to all compromises and concessions for the future. I will never consent to any change of that law which will in the slightest degree impair its efficiency.

MR. CLERK, I will detain the House but a few moments longer, and come now to my last proposition. It is useless to pursue this inquiry further. I might pile extract upon extract, and add declaration to declaration, all tending to the same end, until they would fairly bewilder the gaze of an injured and outraged people. The issues are fully made up between the Republican party North and the people of my section; and the trial between right and wrong, justice and injustice, lawlessness and the Constitution, union and disunion, will soon be had; and I pray God that the result at the ballot-box may not be such as to force upon my people the dire necessity of appealing to the cartridge-box; for let me tell you now, and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (MR. HICKMAN,) that valiant knight who speaks of his eighteen million people, and their auxiliaries of war, that just so sure as the Republican party succeeds in electing a sectional man upon their sectional, anti-slavery platform, breathing destruction and death to the rights of my people, just so sure, in my judgment, the time will have come when the South must and will take unmistakable and decided action; and that then "he who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned." I need not tell what I, as a southern man, will do—and I think I may safely speak for the masses of the people of Georgia—that when that event happens, they, in my judgment, will consider it an overt act, a declaration of war, and meet immediately in convention, to take into consideration the mode and measure of redress. That is my position; and if that be treason to the Government, make the most of it. While I occupy that position, I say to you in all candor, that if you will stay the hand of aggression, and cease your denunciations; if you will respect the rights of my people, and let us alone; if you will stop agitating this question of slavery, and the circulation of incendiary documents to rouse our slaves to insurrection and murder, we may yet live in peace and harmony in the future as our fathers did in the past. If it were left to me to say what should become of this great nation, I would respond, *esto perpetua*. I appeal to you people of the North to attend to your own affairs, and leave us to attend to ours. If you do, we can live in bonds of peace and fraternity; if you do not, on your heads be the consequences.

Now, sir, in the midst of all this fanaticism, darkness, and gloom, it would be culpable in me not to admit that one bright ray of hope is left to gladden the heart of the patriot. I allude to those sound, national northern Democrats, hundreds and thousands of whom, I am assured, are scattered all over the northern States, who have had the wisdom to understand and the moral courage to defend, in the face of the Republican party, the constitutional rights of the people of my country. Language is wanting to express my admiration of those men who have, up to this hour, been true to the rights of all the people. The people of the South will repay with gratitude their adherence to principle, and erect in their hearts a monument to such devotion to the Constitution and to the equal rights of all the States. In the coming conflict, these men at the North will be united with men of the South and East and West, and with the Constitution for their shield, and equal rights under the Constitution to all the people, in the Territories and elsewhere, for their watchword, they will march shoulder

to shoulder, conquering and to conquer, and will, I trust, drive back this common enemy. If they succeed, this gloom will disappear; the Constitution will be preserved; the Union will be perpetuated; and, though the clouds lower and the rains descend, and the thunders roll and the lightnings flash, yet the proud pyramid of States will stand,

"Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm;
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

These men may be few in numbers. Conquered, but undismayed, they will rally again to do battle for the Constitution, and aid us in rolling back the tide of fanaticism. I bid them God speed in their good and patriotic work.

MR. ADRIAN. The gentleman from Georgia has made an appeal to the northern Democracy. I belong to the northern Democracy. But I wish to say to the gentleman that the northern Democracy are true to the Union of these States; and he must be true to it, or else the northern Democracy cannot stand by him. I regret, Mr. Clerk—

MR. GARTRELL. I did not yield to the gentleman for the purpose of his reading me a lecture.

MR. ADRIAN. I did not intend to read the gentleman a lecture; but I wished to set him right. I wish him to understand that the northern Democracy cannot act with the southern Democracy, if they take the ground that the election of a Republican President, according to the laws of the country, is a sufficient cause for dissolution. I wish the gentleman, and other Southern gentlemen, to understand that the northern Democracy cannot act with them on grounds like this. But if they are true to the Union; if they will stand on the Cincinnati platform and the Kansas-Nebraska act, as construed as giving to the people of the Territories the right to prohibit or establish slavery, then we may all be united; and perhaps on such an issue in 1860, with a proper candidate for the Presidency, we will triumph. Otherwise, we will be defeated.

MR. GARTRELL. I believe the gentleman's previous predictions have not been verified.

MR. ADRIAN. I should like the gentleman to specify. I recollect that, in the last Congress, I did predict that if we attempted to force the Lecompton constitution on the people of Kansas, it would break down all of the Democrats who sustained such an issue.

MR. GARTRELL. Oh, I am tired of this playing on a harp of a thousand strings. (Laughter.) Every time that gentleman gets up here, it is Kansas and Kansas and the Lecompton constitution—

MR. ADRIAN. No, sir.

MR. GARTRELL. And what some people thought about it, and what others thought about it. These are past issues. They are by-gones, and I intend to bury them. They are dead, and they stink in the nostrils of my people—

MR. ADRIAN. Mr. Clerk—

MR. GARTRELL. I cannot yield to the gentleman. I am trespassing too long on the House.

MR. ADRIAN. I did not intend to interrupt you. I was speaking of the Union; that is the harp I was playing on, and it gives the best of music.

MR. REFFIN. I object to the gentleman from Georgia being interrupted.

MR. ADRIAN. I understood the gentleman to have yielded me the floor.

MR. GARTRELL. I certainly did not yield the floor, because I knew that my friend—to use a common phrase—when he gets an inch takes an ell. He cannot stop when he gets through. (Laughter.)

MR. HASKIN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? You say the Lecompton issue is dead. Permit me to ask you—

MR. GARTRELL. My dear sir, excuse me. (Laughter.) On some other occasion, after we shall have elected a good, sound, conservative, national Speaker, it will afford me very great pleasure to discuss Lecompton with you. We will exhume the dead body and bring it up.

MR. HASKIN. Will you vote for the admission of Kansas at this session, notwithstanding the English bill?

MR. GARTRELL. That is *dehors* the record. The gentleman is always getting in "ifs." That little word "if" is a potent one with him. If this, or if that, or if something else, if anything, if everything, &c. I do not deal with "ifs," and hope the gentleman will excuse me if I do not go out of my argument to discuss these old questions.

MR. HASKIN. When Kansas applies for admission under the Wyandot constitution, will the gentleman vote for her admission, notwithstanding the English bill?

MR. GARTRELL. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. You shall know my position clearly at the time.

Now, Mr. Clerk, I trust I will be permitted to proceed. I wish to call attention to certain resolutions which I had the honor of offering as a member of the Georgia Legislature, in 1849, and as bearing on the question under discussion, and which were unanimously adopted, and have since been maintained by the people of Georgia without distinction of party.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Constitution grants no power to Congress to prohibit the introduction of slavery into any Territory belonging to the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the several States of the Union acceded to the Confederacy upon terms of perfect equality; and that the rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution belong alike to the people of each State.

"*Resolved*, That any and all territory acquired by the United States, whether by discovery, purchase, or conquest, belongs in common to the people of each State, and thither the people of each and every State have a common right to emigrate with any property they may possess; and that any restriction upon this right which will operate in favor of the people of one section to the exclusion of those of another, is unjust, oppressive, and unwarranted by the Constitution."

MR. GARRELL. I intended to have discussed and to have asserted the clear right of the people of my State, or the people of any one, two, or more States of this Confederacy to retire from this Union at any time, without any conditions or restrictions whatever; that the people have reserved to them the right of peaceable secession; that this Union, formed by equal, independent States, by sovereignties, may be dissolved and discontinued by those sovereignties, in accordance with the great fundamental doctrine of State rights, as announced in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798 and 1799. At another time I may, by the permission of the House, elaborate the positions therein contained. But, sir, the country is familiar with them. They, in my judgment, embody the fundamental principles of this great constitutional Union—that the people of Georgia, or of any other State, or of any number of States, may peaceably secede from this Union and set up for themselves; and that any attempt upon the part of one or more of the other States to coerce them back, would be in violation of the Constitution which they pretend to seek to support. I am happy to announce in this connection, that that doctrine was incorporated into the platform of and adopted by the national Democratic party at Cincinnati. It stands now as a part of the creed of that great, sound, conservative, national party, composed of men who are as true in Illinois as they are in Georgia; men who say to us of the South, "We will not interfere with your rights; we intend to observe the compacts of the Constitution. If you want slavery, have it; it is none of our business." This great and fundamental principle of the right of peaceable secession, incorporated into the Cincinnati platform, is right in principle; and I, as a southern man, stand upon it to-day. It is a great reserved right of the sovereign States to protect them against the burdens of consolidation and oppression.

Now, sir, there is one other point to which I wish to allude. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. HICKMAN,) whom I am very happy to see in his seat, is reported in the Globe, in respect to this question of disunion or secession, as having said:

"But, if dissolution means that there is to be a division of territory, by Mason and Dixon's line, or by any other line, I say no; that shall never be. I express my opinion—and that opinion may go before the country, whether false or true—when I say 'no;' the North will never tolerate a division of the territory. (Applause from the Republican benches.)"

MR. GARRELL. I should like to know how you are to prevent it.

MR. HICKMAN. I will tell you how it will be prevented. I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet; but I express my conviction that there is as much true courage in the North, though it may not be known by the name of chivalry, (sensation,) as there is in the South."

I am glad the gentleman has, at last, in his old age, made that discovery. Nobody has ever questioned it that I ever heard of. I do not stand here to make discriminations between the courage of northern men and southern men. I have enough nationality left, enough true Americanism left, to proclaim everywhere to all corners and goers, that the people of the North, as well as those of the South, know their rights, and when invaded by a foreign foe they will dare maintain them. I have an abiding confidence in the courage of the American

people. It is true, there may be some exceptions, and among those exceptions may be included those fanatics who can "scent a nigger in the breeze;" the men who are always complaining of other people's woes and ills, but who fail to correct their own; intermeddlers, tattlers, who, when the hour of trial comes, are not to be found. So I say to you gentlemen of the North, when you expect to come down to conquer the South, do not take the Abolitionists with you. If you come to the South, you will have to come with true men. The gentleman says:

"There is as much true courage at the North as there is at the South. I always believed it, and, therefore, I will express it: and I believe, sir, that with all the appliances of art to assist, eighteen millions of men reared to industry, with habits of the right kind, will always be able to cope successfully, if need be, with eight millions of men without those 'auxiliaries.'"

The gentleman says these eighteen millions of men are reared to habits of the right kind. What does he mean by that? Does he intimate fighting habits? Mr. Clerk, I am not going into the habits of northern or southern men. I am willing to grant the gentleman the benefit of his discovery, that northern men are as brave as southern men. He says they have got habits of the right kind, and that they have the "auxiliaries." I suppose that means the appliances of war—Sharpe's rifles, pikes, and—

Mr. HICKMAN. If the gentleman will give me an opportunity to do so, I will state precisely what I did mean.

Mr. GARRIGALL. I will yield if you will not take too much time.

Mr. HICKMAN. I mean that when the time shall come, if, indeed, it ever shall come, when a dissolution of the Union shall be persisted in by the people of any State, or by the people of many States, there will be found at that time a settled determination to prevent such dissolution at all costs and at every sacrifice. That is what I mean in the first place; that we, of the North, have eighteen millions to your eight; that we have all the arts to assist us; that we are inured to industry; that we can make more arms and ammunition in ninety days than the South can buy; and that more men will voluntarily enroll themselves under that banner which shall have inscribed upon it, "the Constitution and the Union," than can be raised by conscription at the South. That is what I mean; and I trust that there will be no misapprehension with regard to my meaning hereafter.

I wish to say a word further, and only a single word, because I find that this is "the harp of a thousand strings"—these eighteen million men. Gentlemen seem to congratulate themselves here with the idea that there is a divided North on the subject of the maintenance of this Union. Now, sir, what Democratic Representative is there upon this floor who coincides in opinion with the gentleman from Georgia, that the election of a Republican President—of any man constitutionally put into the Presidential chair—will, *ipso facto*, be cause for secession? Who is there that agrees with him here on that point? Unless they go to that extent, and say that their people back them up in that opinion, then I declare to-day that there is an undivided North in favor of the maintenance of the Constitution and the Union, and that at all costs, I repeat, and at every hazard, it must and will be maintained. (Applause in the galleries.)

Mr. GARRIGALL. I have often heard that song of the Union sung; it is stereotyped in these debates; and, sir, the *chapters* of the gallery, who know nothing of the Union outside of the spoils of office, applaud whenever there is any talk of the Union. You may applaud, you may fiddle and dance and carouse when your liberties are being swept away by this sectional party. (Applause in the galleries.) I am glad that the member from Pennsylvania has made his explanation; I have been trying to get him upon the record.

Mr. HICKMAN. There is no difficulty in getting me upon the record in reference to the opinions I entertain. I do not want any gentleman upon this floor to be mistaken as to what I mean. Whether any opinion I may entertain is for me or against me, I will express it.

Mr. GARRIGALL. I hope that the gentleman will not further interrupt me. I wish to reply to what he stated in his first interruption.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania adds insult to injury. Says he: we have eighteen million men, and we can make more arms than you can buy. Why, sir, one cotton crop of Georgia would buy all the arms in Pennsylvania. (Laughter and applause in the galleries.)

Mr. HICKMAN took the floor.

Mr. GARRIGALL. I cannot permit further interruption, having already occupied more time than I intended.

Do not gentlemen know that of the \$60,000,000 of revenue raised to support this Government, the South pays \$40,000,000 and the North only \$20,000,000, and that in its

distribution you get \$10,000,000 and we only \$20,000,000? We give you, in other words, a bonus of \$20,000,000 to sing songs to the Union. It costs too much: I can buy songs cheaper than that at home—original poetry at that. (Laughter.)

I stand here no advocate of dissolution now. I am no disunionist, *per se*. I defy anybody to show where I ever stated, that when my rights under the Constitution were maintained, I was in favor of a dissolution of the Union. I am for the Union of the Constitution, and you are against the Constitution. Now, sir, when that time comes, we will welcome the valiant knight from Pennsylvania with his eighteen million men. Will he be at the head of a regiment?

MR. HICKMAN. The gentleman refuses to give me the slightest opportunity to reply.

MR. GARTRELL. I have given you the simplest opportunity.

MR. HICKMAN. I would like to put in a single word here.

MR. GARTRELL. Let me ask the gentleman one question that will settle this controversy: If the Republican party succeed in electing a sectional candidate, and securing the control of both branches of the national Legislature, abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, the slave-trade between the States, prohibit the introduction of slavery into any of the Territories, and refuse the admission of a State because of slavery in its constitution—if, sir, the Republican party does any one or all of these things, and the South secedes from the Union, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania be ready to head a regiment and coerce her back?

MR. HICKMAN. My answer to that is a very brief one. I believe, sir, that the proper place to redress grievances, real or imaginary, is in the Union, and not outside of it. I think that this is, especially, the forum for the South; for I think that she will never be able to redress any grievances, real or imaginary, outside of it. I cannot look forward to a time——

MR. GARTRELL. I cannot yield to the gentleman for the purpose of making a speech.

MR. HICKMAN. Let me finish. I do not think any party will take it upon themselves to violate the compact existing between the North and the South. I will not look forward to a time, I will not anticipate that day, when this country will have become so demoralized as to stand as a nation of traitors.

MR. GARTRELL. I consider that the gentleman fails to answer my question, and when he again addresses the House he will not, as he did on the occasion I have referred to, refuse me the opportunity to interrupt him with a single word.

I was commenting, when interrupted, upon the remark of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the North could manufacture more arms and ammunition than the South could buy. When they come down to the South, let me tell them, that we will be prepared to receive them, that every plowshare will be turned into a sword, and every plow-boy will stand ready to drive back the northern mercenaries. (Applause in the galleries.) Even the slaves will be ready to meet you, and defend the homes and firesides of their masters and mistresses. They would repulse you, for they scorn your interference in their behalf. They scout your abolitionism you fanatics who neglect the poorer classes at your own homes. They say that you had better attend to your own paupers. Let me tell the gentleman from Ohio (MR. STANTON) that I will take him to Georgia, if he pleases, and that if he finds a pauper negro there, I will give him ten for every one he finds. You never knew, sir, of a negro begging in the South; but go to the northern States, and you see there the thousand emaciated hands stretched out for alms.

You talk about philanthropy and humanity! Attend to your own poor and your own affairs. "Physician, heal thyself." I do not allude to these things in any spirit of boasting. God knows I pity the poor men and the poor women of the northern States. I would have them come to the South, where there is a more genial climate, and where they could be fed, clothed, and protected, and nursed, when sick, by our slaves.

Gentlemen of the House, I thank you for your kind attention, and will detain you but a moment longer. A few days ago, the citizens of Savannah, a large commercial city of my State, observant of these insults and aggressions, met, as I am informed, without respect of party, and organized a vigilant association for the protection of the rights of themselves and their fellow-citizens. Among other things, they adopted some resolutions, which so fully

coincide with my own opinions upon the present condition of the country, that I send them to the Clerk's desk and ask they may be read for the information of this House and the country.

The resolutions were read, as follows :

"4. *Resolved*, That, looking forward to a time when all ties which now connect us with the northern States of this Confederacy may be severed, and considering that prudence as well as a proper regard for the interests of our own section demand that all our domestic resources should be fostered and developed, we earnestly recommend: 1. Direct foreign trade. 2. The patronage of southern commerce and manufactures. 3. Education in southern schools and colleges. 4. Patronage to southern authors and editors. 5. The employment of southern teachers, and the use of southern school books. 6. Non-intercourse with all cities and sections at the North inimical to slavery and southern institutions. And to secure respect to these recommendations, we individually and collectively pledge ourselves in all cases to prefer in our business, or for our use, the natural and artificial productions of the South to all others, and goods of foreign origin which have been imported *directly* into a southern port, to those of the same character imported through a northern port.

"5. *Resolved*, That we earnestly request of the various transportation lines of this and the adjacent States, that they will so modify their rates of freight that the iron, coal, slate, granite, lime, and other mineral productions of our own and the adjoining States, may be brought to this market at prices which will enable them to compete with similar articles of northern production.

"6. *Resolved*, That we recommend to our Legislature, 1. To establish a normal school, at which teachers may be trained, who shall, in all cases, be preferred as instructors in the free schools of this State. 2. To require that all the books used in the free schools of this State shall be the productions of southern authors, and be printed on southern paper by southern presses.

"7. *Resolved*, That we recommend to those of our citizens who have habitually, during their annual visits to the North, and at other times, purchased their supplies of dry goods, groceries, hardware, and other articles from northern merchants, hereafter to extend their patronage in these respects to the dealers in such commodities, who are part of our own people, share in the defence of our institutions, and contribute to our prosperity.

"8. *Resolved*, That African slavery, as it exists in these United States, is morally and politically right, and is a blessing to both races, and to the world at large; and that it is our duty, as patriots and Christians, to expand and perpetuate it.

"9. *Resolved*, That we ask no guarantee for the institution of slavery, founded, as the natural conditions of man, and established by divine appointment. We only demand that it stand or fall upon its own merits. But inasmuch as the rendition of fugitive slaves was a precedent to the formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution, it is incumbent and obligatory upon the General Government, and upon each of the State governments, to adopt and enforce such measures as will effectually carry out a constitutional provision so just and so indispensable. We consider, therefore, that such States as have passed laws in opposition to this provision of the Constitution, with intent to hinder, prevent, or render difficult the speedy rendition of fugitive slaves, have violated the original compact of the Union between the States, and that they are in open rebellion to the General Government, and, as a consequence, are not entitled to representation in the Halls of Congress. Therefore, we recommend to our Senators and Representatives in Congress to object, in the most effectual manner in their power, to the admission into their respective Houses of Representatives from any and all such rebellious and revolutionary States."

MR. GARTRELL. Those resolutions speak for themselves. I shall attempt no comment upon them, more than to call upon gentlemen from the North to note the fact that our people are not laboring under such a delusion as you suppose; that they are aroused to a keen sense of their rights, and will assert them fearlessly, and defend them at every hazard. Yet, we love the Union for its past glories; we desire that it may be perpetuated, and will never consent to violate the common Constitution of our fathers. You have placed your sacrilegious hands upon that sacred instrument, but southern men never will; and whenever your violations of it become too intolerable to be borne, I announce now, in conclusion, as I did in the beginning, that, although a love of Union animates our people, yet every man—yea, every matron and every fair daughter of the South—will exclaim with me, "Give us disunion rather than dishonor and disgrace." I thank the House for its patient attention, and now yield the floor.